

Osborne	Rush	Tanner
Ose	Ryan (OH)	Tauscher
Otter	Ryan (WI)	Taylor (MS)
Owens	Ryun (KS)	Taylor (NC)
Oxley	Sabo	Terry
Pallone	Sánchez, Linda	Thomas
Pascarell	T.	Thompson (CA)
Pastor	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)
Paul	Sanders	Thornberry
Payne	Sandlin	Tiahrt
Pelosi	Saxton	Tiberi
Pence	Schakowsky	Tierney
Peterson (MN)	Schiff	Toomey
Peterson (PA)	Schrock	Towns
Petri	Scott (GA)	Turner (OH)
Pickering	Scott (VA)	Turner (TX)
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Udall (CO)
Platts	Serrano	Udall (NM)
Pombo	Sessions	Upton
Pomeroy	Shadegg	Van Hollen
Porter	Shaw	Velázquez
Portman	Shays	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Sherman	Vitter
Pryce (OH)	Sherwood	Walden (OR)
Putnam	Shinkus	Walsh
Quinn	Shuster	Wamp
Radanovich	Simmons	Waters
Rahall	Simpson	Watson
Ramstad	Skelton	Watt
Rangel	Slaughter	Waxman
Regula	Smith (MI)	Weiner
Rehberg	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (FL)
Renzi	Smith (TX)	Weldon (PA)
Reyes	Smith (WA)	Weller
Reynolds	Snyder	Wexler
Rodriguez	Solis	Whitfield
Rogers (AL)	Souder	Wicker
Rogers (KY)	Spratt	Wilson (NM)
Rogers (MI)	Stark	Wilson (SC)
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Stenholm	Woolsey
Ross	Strickland	Wu
Rothman	Stupak	Wynn
Roybal-Allard	Sullivan	Young (AK)
Royce	Sweeney	Young (FL)
Ruppersberger	Tancredo	

NOT VOTING—12

Brady (TX)	Gephardt	Leach
Davis (AL)	Hastings (WA)	Moran (VA)
DeMint	Hayworth	Pearce
Deutsch	Larson (CT)	Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1947

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on S. Con. Res. 95, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Price of North Carolina moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 95 be instructed to agree to the pay-as-you-go enforcement provisions within the scope of the conference regarding direct spending increases and tax cuts in the House and Sen-

ate. In complying with this instruction, such managers shall be instructed to recede to the Senate on the provisions contained in section 408 of the Senate concurrent resolution (relating to the pay-as-you-go point of order regarding all legislation increasing the deficit as a result of direct spending increases and tax cuts).

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Stenholm of Texas moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 95 be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to reject provisions that provide for an increase in the statutory debt limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This instruction is pretty simple. The effect of this motion would be to call on the House and the Senate to have a full and open debate and vote on increasing the debt limit, instead of using the budget resolution to avoid a debate on increasing our Nation's debt limit.

Under House rules, passage of the budget resolution conference report would deem that the House had passed separate legislation increasing the debt limit upon passage of the budget resolution, without a separate vote or opportunity for debate or amendments on the issue. Republicans were highly critical of this rule when the House of Representatives was under Democratic control and repealed it in 1997, but have revised it now that the national debt is growing at a record pace.

As a result of the Hastert rule, passage of the budget resolution conference report in the House and Senate would automatically approve a \$700 billion increase in the debt limit to increase our Nation's debt limit to more than \$8 trillion, without a separate vote and at least discussion, which we at least will have tonight.

Last year, the Republican leadership slipped through a \$984 billion increase in the debt limit, the largest increase in the debt limit in the history of our country without an up-and-down vote. This came less than 8 months after we raised the Federal debt ceiling by a whopping \$450 billion, and now the House leadership is trying to slip through another \$700 billion increase in the debt limit without any debate.

That is wrong. In this, the people's House, the House of Representatives,

we should be discussing and debating this issue of major significance.

The national debt has increased by \$670 billion over the last 12 months and \$1.5 trillion over the last 3 years. The Congressional Budget Office projects that the national debt will exceed \$10 trillion in just over 4 years under our current budget policies, which the majority in this body say we will not change.

Congress should have a full and open debate and vote, up or down, on increasing our national debt limit above \$8 trillion. It would be irresponsible to use parliamentary maneuvers to slip an increase in the debt limit into law without addressing the fiscal problems highlighted by the need to increase the debt limit.

If my Republican colleagues honestly believe that tax cuts with borrowed money is good economic policy, if my Republican colleagues believe that three wars and three tax cuts, soon to be four, is good economic policy, then my colleagues should have the courage to stand up and vote and tell the American people. We are going to increase our credit card limit in order to make room for that economic policy.

Just like credit card spending limits serve as tools to force families to examine their household budgets, the debt limit reminds Congress and the President to evaluate and sometimes reevaluate our budget policies.

It has been very frustrating for me, constantly and consistently with my majority friends, seeing no willingness to take another look at the economic policy we are under. Just borrow the money and keep on trucking and explain it away.

Any farmer or small businessman who needs an extension of their credit must work with the bank to reestablish a financial plan in order to get approval from the bank. We should be following that principle by working on putting our budget back in order before we vote to raise our credit limit.

One of the things Congress should consider as part of the full and open debate we are calling for when we increase the debt limit is reinstating budget enforcement rules which make it harder to pass legislation which puts us further into debt; and tonight, my hat is off to our fiscally responsible Senators, the "fiscal four" in the other body that are holding forth, that are saying to the Senate and to this House, who are not listening, we will not vote for a budget that does not reinstate pay-as-you-go rules.

Pay-as-you-go was good in 1990 when I worked with the then-minority in passing it. Pay-as-you-go was good in 1997 when the Republicans had taken over this body and some of us voted with my colleagues. In fact, without us, they could not have passed it. We said pay-as-you-go was a good budget enforcement tactic.

I see the chairman of the Committee on the Budget is here tonight, and I will ask him right now, what is it